

Rules Not “Harmonized”

■ Clearly defined example: Australia

- Our laboratory like many others use a combination of criteria to assess whether a sample is positive. Our current criteria are –
 1. The difference between the average of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ A and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ Et values, and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ 11-keto must be greater than 4.0‰.
 2. The ratio must be greater than 1.15.
 3. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ A and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ Et must be more negative than -27.0‰.

All must be met for a sample to be called positive.

Australian WADA-accredited Lab Criteria 2004. [1]

Notice that the Australian lab reduces the likelihood of a false positive result by setting their positivity criteria beyond 4.0.

Although WADA is charged with unifying labs, examined metabolites and positivity criteria differ from lab to lab.

I view this as a failure of WADA to (1) provide fairness and equality and (2) ensure a harmonized (standardized/uniform) program.

Few labs publish their positivity criteria.

By Australia lab criteria, Floyd's test is negative.

[1] Australian rules downloaded from: http://www.aph.gov.au/SEnate/committee/economics_ctte/estimates/bud_0405/industry/addinfo/statistical_population_studies_mar04.pdf#search=%22Kazlauskas%20%22anti-doping%20research%20program%22%22.